

**OPINION 2261 (Case 3450)**

***Chrysophanus florus* Edwards 1884 (currently *Lycaena florus*) (Insecta, Lepidoptera, LYCAENIDAE): specific name conserved by designation of a neotype for *Polyommatus castro* Reakirt, 1866 (currently *Lycaena castro*)**

**Abstract.** The Commission has ruled that the specific name *Chrysophanus florus* Edwards 1884 (currently *Lycaena florus*) (Insecta, Lepidoptera, LYCAENIDAE) for a butterfly species from North America is conserved by designation of a male of *Lycaena helloides* (Boisduval, 1852) as neotype for *Polyommatus castro* Reakirt, 1866 (currently *Lycaena castro*).

**Keywords.** Nomenclature; taxonomy; Insecta; Lepidoptera; LYCAENIDAE; *Lycaena*; *Lycaena castro*; *Lycaena florus*; *Lycaena helloides*; *Lycaena dorcas*; coppers; Rocky Mountains.

---

**Ruling**

- (1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that all previous type fixations for *castro* Reakirt 1866, as published in the binomen *Polyommatus castro*, are set aside and the male specimen identified as *Polyommatus helloides* Boisduval, 1852 from Lakewood, Jefferson Co., Colorado, is hereby designated as the neotype.
- (2) The name *helloides* Boisduval, 1852, as published in the binomen *Polyommatus helloides* is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

**History of Case 3450**

An application to conserve the widely used name *Chrysophanus florus* Edwards, 1884 (currently *Lycaena florus*) for a butterfly species from North America by designating a neotype for *Polyommatus castro* Reakirt, 1866 was received from James A. Scott (*Lakewood, CO, U.S.A.*) on 10 January 2008. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 66: 136–143 (June 2009). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. Two comments in support of this case were published in 66: 273 (September 2009) and 66: 352 (December 2008).

**Decision of the Commission**

On 1 June 2010 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 66: 140–141 (June 2009). At the close of the voting period on 1 September 2010 the votes were as follows

Affirmative votes – 20: Ballerio, Bogutskaya, Bouchet, Brothers, Fautin, Grygier, Halliday, Harvey, Krell, Lamas, Minelli, Ng, Pape, Papp, Rosenberg, van Tol, Winston, Yanega, Zhang and Zhou.

Negative votes – 4: Kojima, Kullander, Lim and Štys.

Alonso-Zarazaga, Kottelat, Patterson and Pyle were on leave of absence.

Kojima, voting AGAINST, said he could not understand the exact purpose of this proposal which seemed to ask that the Commission use its plenary power to designate the specimen that the author collected as the neotype of *Polyommatus castro* Reakirt, 1866 in order to make the author's taxonomic decision reflected in the nomenclature of the butterflies concerned. Štys, voting AGAINST, said that nomenclatural decisions should not be used to resolve an apparently incompletely understood taxonomy.

Lamas voting FOR, suggested that Proposal (2) in paragraph 15 should be modified by deletion of the last half of the sentence, beginning with '... and as defined by ...'. *Polyommatus helloides* is certainly not 'defined by the neotype ... for *Polyommatus castro* ...' as claimed. The application of the name *P. helloides* is defined by reference to its name-bearing type, the male lectotype validly designated by Emmel et al. (1998). (Secretariat's note – this suggested change has been implemented).

### Original references

The following is the original reference to the name placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

*helloides*, *Polyommatus*, Boisduval, 1852, *Annales de la Société Entomologique de France*, (2)**10**: 291.